

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed August 21, 2007 (hereinafter, "Office Action"), claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1-15 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 15 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully respond to the Office Action.

I. Claims 1-15 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 15 have been amended to recite "the adapter does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter." Applicants submit that the subject matter amended to claims 1, 8, 13 and 15 is described in Applicants' specification. In particular, support for this amendment may be found in Applicants' specification, page 10, line 7-page 11, line 3 and Figures 7-12.

The Office Action asserts that "a serial port 124 for communications with a user appliance . . . [discloses] a user interface that is local to the adapter." (Office Action, page 2.) However, the serial port described in Applicants' specification and figures is not "a user interface with a display." In addition, the Office Action asserts that "the appliance [i.e., the electronic device] being also a user interface that is local to the adapter." (Office Action, page 3.) However, the adapter "does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter." Instead, the Office Action asserts that the adapter comprises a user interface via the appliance. The cited portions of Applicants' specification, as well as the cited Figures, clearly support an adapter that "does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter." There is no teaching in Applicants' specification or Figures of a communications adapter that is integrated with a user interface with a display such that the user interface is "a part of the adapter."

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the subject matter amended to claims 1, 8, 13 and 15 is supported by Applicants' specification. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 8, 13 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 depend directly from claim 1. Claims 9-12 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 8 and claim 14 depends directly from claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-7, 9-12 and 14 be withdrawn.

II. Claims 1-15 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,074,434 to Cole et al. (hereinafter, “Cole”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,045 to Lieu et al. (hereinafter, “Lieu”), and alternatively over Cole in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,274 to Lindgren (hereinafter, “Lindgren”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The factual inquiries that are relevant in the determination of obviousness are determining the scope and contents of the prior art, ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue, resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art, and evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, at **4-5 (2007) (*citing Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966)). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references “must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2142. Moreover, the analysis in support of an obviousness rejection “should be made explicit.” KSR, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, at **37. “[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” Id. (*citing In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims at issue are patentably distinct from the cited references. The cited references do not teach or suggest all of the subject matter in these claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “the adapter does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter.” Cole, alone or in combination with Lieu and Lindgren, does not teach or suggest this subject matter. Support for this amendment may be found in Applicants’ specification, for example, page 10, line 7 – page 11, line 3 and Figures 7 – 12.

The Office Action points to reference numeral 14 in Figure 2 of Cole to support the assertion that “Cole teaches a communications adapter”. (See Office Action, page 4.) Reference numeral 14 in Figure 2 of Cole is referred to as a client. (See Cole, col. 3, line 18.) A client, as taught by Cole, does not teach or suggest an “adapter [that] does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter.” Instead, Cole states “each of the clients 14-16 comprises a personal computer.” (Cole, col. 3, line 23.) A personal computer (PC) does comprise a local user interface with a display (e.g. a monitor). Cole states “[t]he client 14 includes an update manager program 32 (including a GUI) [graphical user interface].” (Cole, col. 3, lines 57-58.) A PC that includes a GUI does not teach or suggest an adapter that “does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter.”

Further, Cole states “[a] user at client computer 14 selects an icon to invoke update manager.” (Cole, col. 3, lines 62-64.) Thus, the user executes the selection via a local user interface with a display because Cole states “[a] user at client computer.” (Id.) In addition, Cole states “the update selection program . . . builds a selection form for display at the client.” (Cole, col. 6, lines 54-56.) Displaying a selection at the client teaches a client that is integrated with a user interface with a display (i.e. monitor, display, etc.)

The Office Action also asserts that “Lieu teaches an adapter.” (Office Action, page 5.) The Office Action points to reference numeral 201 in Figure 2 of Lieu to support this assertion. (Id.) Reference numeral 201 of Figure 2 is a “computer.” (Lieu, col. 4, line 25.) Lieu does not teach or suggest that the computer is a communications adapter that “does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter.” In fact, Lieu teaches the exact opposite.

Lieu states “computer 201 advantageously also comprises: a keyboard, a pointing device for a graphical user interface (e.g., a mouse, a touchpad, etc.) . . . a speaker, and a microphone.” (Lieu, col. 4, lines 33-36.) A computer that includes a GUI does not teach or suggest a communications adapter that “does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter.”

In addition, the Office Action asserts that "Lindgren teaches an adapter." (Office Action, page 5.) The Office Action points to reference numeral 100 in Figure 1 of Lindgren to support this assertion. (Id.) Reference numeral 100 of Figure 1 is a personal digital assistant (PDA). (See Lindgren, col. 2, line 52.) The PDA taught in Lindgren does not teach or suggest a communications adapter that "does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter." Instead, Lindgren teaches "displaying an appropriate alpha-numeric or icon symbol on the PDA screen, and/or sounding an appropriate audible sound using the PDA speaker/transducer." (Lindgren, col. 4, lines 36-38.) A PDA that includes a screen to "display[] an . . . alpha-numeric or icon symbol" does not teach or suggest a communications adapter that "does not comprise a user interface with a display that is integrated as a part of the adapter."

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn because Cole, alone or in combination with Lieu or Lindgren, does not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim 1.

Claims 2-7 depend directly from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 13 and 15 have been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claims 8, 13 and 15 are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8, 13 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 8 and claim 14 depends directly from claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9-12 and 14 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/784,485
Amdt. dated November 21, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 21, 2007

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully assert that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references, and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



/Wesley L. Austin/

Wesley L. Austin
Reg. No. 42,273
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: November 21, 2007

MADSON & AUSTIN
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: (801) 537-1700